AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings adds a new Fig. 1.

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application. Reconsideration is now respectfully requested in view of the amendment above and the following remarks.

Claims 20-38 are pending in this application. Claims 20 and 39 are the independent claims. Claims 20-33 and 35-37 have been amended without prejudice. Claim 38 has been cancelled without prejudice herein. New Claim 39 has been added without prejudice herein. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 stands rejected purportedly because the recited method could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without being tied to a machine nor is any transformation apparent. *See, 11/17/2009 Office action, par. 2.* Without acquiescing to the properness of this rejection, and solely for non-limiting purposes of expediting prosecution of the subject application, Claim 20 has been amended without prejudice to recite, *inter alia*, "storing the at least one modified block in a memory;" and "transmitting a modified compressed digital text in conformity with a format of the original compressed digital text, the modified compressed digital text comprising the stored at least one modified block."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Drawings

Applicant has been required to submit a drawing. Applicant has included herewith a copy of the WIPO published drawing from the Pair database, amended to omit the WIPO information and include a "New Sheet" label. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the requirement has been complied with.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 stands rejected purportedly because "the original compressed digital text comprising modified blocks" is unclear. Without acquiescing to the properness of this rejection, and solely for non-limiting purposes of expediting prosecution of the subject application, Claim 20 has been amended without prejudice to recite, *inter alia*, "modifying at least one instance of binary data in at least one of the blocks according to at least one substitution operation comprising extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block ...; storing the at least one modified block in a memory; [and] transmitting a modified compressed digital text in conformity with a format of the original compressed digital text, the modified compressed digital text comprising the stored at least one modified block."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 20, 24-32, 35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0148356 to Bishop et al. (hereinafter "Bishop et al."). Claims 20-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,730,348 to MacCrisken (hereinafter "MacCrisken"). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, "[a] process for secure distribution of compressed digital texts formed by blocks of binary data stemming from digital transformations applied to an original text, comprising: modifying at least one instance of binary data in at least one of the blocks according to at least one substitution operation comprising extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block." Claim 20 also recites, *inter alia*, that "the binary data to be modified is indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data." And, *inter alia*, that "the decoy is indicative of a

reference to at least a second other instance of the binary data different than the at least one first other instance of the binary data." For non-limiting purposes of explanation, support for such an approach may be found throughout the specification, such as by way of particular non-limiting example at paragraph [0027] of the substitute specification, which teaches:

> [0027]   The process includes, after analysis of the compressed digital text, extracting at least one original binary data in the compressed digital text, which original binary data represents a code or an entry in a coding table or a pointer, which data is randomly selected, and in replacing it by a binary data called a decoy of the same size and of the same nature, but with a random value to generate a compressed digital text in conformity with the format of the original compressed digital text. The displaying of the modified compressed digital text then restores a text that is illegible and/or incomprehensible from a semantic viewpoint for a human being.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Bishop and MacCrisken each fail to teach, or for that matter even suggest such a process.

Turning first to Bishop, the Office action argues it teaches the recited modifying where it allegedly compresses/encrypts a message block to generate a decoy. *See, Office action, par. 5, ll. 6-8, citing pars. [0074], [0124] and [0007] of Bishop; see also, pg. 5, ll. 1-5, also citing pars. [0074], [0124] and [0007] of Bishop.* Applicant traverses this assertion for at least the following reasons.

The cited portions of Bishop neither refer nor even relate to any decoy that "is indicative of a reference to at least a second other instance of the binary data different than the at least one first other instance of the binary data." – as is recited by Claim 20.

For example, paragraph [0007] of Bishop merely asserts that communications link, file and attachment encryption have been proposed. *Bishop, par. [0007] ("Conventional techniques for encrypting message content include attachment encryption and end-to-end message encryption using PGP. Attachment encryption may be carried out with applications that support Internet Standard secure email via compliance with the S/MIME protocol. Also, a sender can create content as a separate file, encode 1 it using a standalone encryption program such as "crypt" or "WinZip" (even though WinZip is a compression and archiving program, its ability to password-protect a file is a form of encryption), and attach it to a message containing nothing else.").* Paragraph [0074] of Bishop merely proposes that messages may be formatted in blocks

9

prior to encryption. *See, Bishop, par. [0074] ("In general, the content of a message to be sent through Private Messaging System 100 will comprise one or more blocks of information. ... In order to convey these content blocks in a message, they must be formatted prior to encryption so as to preserve their structure ....")* And, paragraph [0124] of Bishop merely proposes that a message may be converted to Postscript, compressed and presented by printing using a special printer driver. *Bishop, par. [0124] ("In an alternate embodiment, Restricted messages may be converted to Postscript, compressed, and presented using a dedicated viewer program which provides no ability to extract content. Encryption identical to that used for Private messages applies in this embodiment to Restricted messages as well. The usual technique for reformatting an arbitrary file into Postscript is also well known to those skilled in the art, and again involves using the file's native application to print it while specifying a printer driver that is especially designed to write out the information as a file containing Postscript commands.")*

None of end-to-end link encryption, file or attachment encryption, password protecting compressed files, and/or printing a file using a special Postscript printer driver "modif[ies] at least one instance of binary data in at least one of the blocks according to at least one substitution operation comprising ***extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block, wherein the binary data to be modified is indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data and the decoy is indicative of a reference to at least a second other instance of the binary data different than the at least one first other instance of the binary data***", as is recited by Claim 20. ***(Emphasis added)***

Similarly, MacCrisken fails to teach, or even suggest such a process. The Office action argues MacCrisken teaches the recited modifying at column 2, lines 37-44. *See, Office action, par. 6, ll. 6-8.* Applicant traverses this assertion for at least the following reasons as well.

First, MacCrisken fails to even relate to any process of secure distribution, no less the particularly recited "process for secure distribution of compressed digital texts", which includes, *inter alia*, "extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block, wherein the binary data to be modified is indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data", of Claim 20. That is, Claim 20 calls for secure distribution of digital texts that have already been "compressed" and include "binary

data … indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data". Instead, the cited MacCrisken passage merely concerns compression itself.

Further, the Office action cited portion of MacCrisken fails to teach or even suggest "extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block, wherein the binary data to be modified is indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data and the decoy is indicative of a reference to at least a second other instance of the binary data different than the at least one first other instance of the binary data" as is recited by Claim 20.

Instead, the cited MacCrisken passage concerns a system having two data compression units -- one on each end of the channel. Input data is encoded using a selected one of a plurality of encoding tables. When an analysis of the encoded data indicates that the data is not being efficiently compressed, the system invokes a table changer for selecting from among the encoding tables the one which minimizes the bit length of the encoded data for a preselected sample of the input data. *See, MacCrisken, col. 2, ll. 25-49.*

Selecting between different coding tables used to compress input data neither teaches nor even suggests "extracting the binary data to be modified and replacing it with at least one decoy to provide at least one modified block, wherein the binary data to be modified is indicative of a reference to at least a first other instance of the binary data and the decoy is indicative of a reference to at least a second other instance of the binary data different than the at least one first other instance of the binary data" as is recited by Claim 20.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 20-32, 35 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 33, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bishop et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,861,827 to Welch et al. (hereinafter "Welch et al."). Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bishop et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,390 to Bucher et al. (hereinafter "Bucher et al."). Each of Claims 33, 34, 36 and 37 ultimately depends from Claim 20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests

the rejections of Claims 33, 34, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn, at least by virtue of these claims' dependencies upon base Claim 20.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-01120-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 17, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

                                             Electronic signature: /Jonathan M. Darcy/
                                             Jonathan M. Darcy
                                               Registration No.: 44,054
                                             CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
                                             1875 Eye Street, NW
                                             Suite 1100
                                             Washington, DC 20006
                                             (202) 331-7111
                                             (202) 293-6229 (Fax)
                                             Attorney for Applicant